

To: Renninger, Steven[renninger.steven@epa.gov]; Smith, Madelyn[madelyn.smith@epa.ohio.gov]
Cc: Lauren Foster[lauren.foster@tetrattech.com]
From: Patterson, Leslie
Sent: Mon 8/11/2014 7:48:39 PM
Subject: RE: SDD&L - VI Removal Action Comments on Utility Corridor Sampling Addendum (May 22)

Hi Steve,

I think you're right that the removal order will be in "O&M" for a few years before a remedy is in place.

I am listed as a project manager so I can send comments on EPA's behalf on the utility corridor proposal. Did Lauren or her predecessor review it and have any comments? It isn't part of CH2MHill's current work assignment to assist in oversight of the removal order.

Leslie Patterson

Remedial Project Manager

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5

Superfund Remedial Response, SR-6J

77 West Jackson Boulevard

Chicago, IL 60604

tel: (312) 886-4904

fax: (312) 692-2491

patterson.leslie@epa.gov

From: Renninger, Steven
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:00 PM
To: Smith, Madelyn
Cc: Patterson, Leslie; Lauren Foster

Subject: RE: SDD&L - VI Removal Action Comments on Utility Corridor Sampling Addendum (May 22)

Leslie and Maddie:

The removal work under the AOC will be completed for the most part this fall when everything has been mitigated (or attempted based on access). After that, the majority of remaining work will be annual monitoring for buildings. The removal AOC will stay in place until we are satisfied or the monitoring work is rolled into a remedial order. Not sure what your timeline is, but the removal order may be in an O&M phase for a couple of years until a remedial action?

With respect to the Utility Corridor addendum, I would like for you guys to take the lead on drafting comments since you will likely be dealing with this issue over the next couple of years. I agree that they can reduce monitoring frequency. Can't remember if we listed Leslie as a EPA Project Manager on the AOC? If not, send me your comments and I will submit them under my signature.

Do you agree?

Thanks.

Steve Renninger

US EPA On-Scene Coordinator

Emergency Response Branch

26 W. Martin Luther King Drive

Cincinnati, OH 45268

513-260-7849



From: Smith, Madelyn [<mailto:madelyn.smith@epa.ohio.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 10:20 AM
To: Renninger, Steven
Cc: Patterson, Leslie
Subject: SDD&L - VI Removal Action Comments on Utility Corridor Sampling Addendum (May 22)

Steve,

The following are my comments on the Draft Utility Corridor Sampling Addendum (May 22, 2014) for South Dayton Dump and Landfill in Moraine, OH.

Please give me a call and we can discuss.

Did you and your reviewers have any comments on the WP?

1. Targeted GP-02 and Building 15

a. Would it be more prudent to have a comprehensive utility investigation where utilities for the affected area are identified and investigated along both Dryden Road and East River Road? Is this perhaps a task to be done under the Remedial Investigation? Has this already been done?

The PRPs are citing the lack of detections in the gas probe network for justification of no further action but how was placement of the probes decided? Were utility corridors and preferential pathways targeted for probe placement? If the gas probe network was originally designed based

on the determination of preferential pathways, then a comprehensive utility investigation may not be needed.

The network was sampled in the fall of 2009. Variations in seasons can affect gas flow (as seen with GP-02 spiking around mid-July through October). For effects on water table, summer months may be preferable. For lateral migration of gases under a cap scenario, the best time to sample to get an understanding of preferential pathways would be in the winter months when the ground is frozen and essentially acting as a cap to keep the gases from escaping vertically.

Consider that though the gas probe network may be extensive, it has not been comprehensively sampled (so effects on seasonality may not be apparent) and may not have been designed with preferential pathways in mind (there may be abandoned utilities that do not connect to buildings but can transport the gases off site). If our goal is to find where explosive gases might be leaving the boundary, then we would want to explore the preferential pathways keeping in mind that some pathways may be present only during specific seasons.

2. Qualifiers for an actual utility corridor investigation

a. Building 15 – utilities will only be investigated if methane levels below the building are above 10% LEL (0.5% CH₄), and if select gas probes around building 15 are then sampled and if any one of the select probes is above 100% LEL for 2 consecutive weeks, then utilities around Building 15 will be investigated.

Why would we wait to sample preferential pathways if we have a threshold exceedance occurring below an occupied structure? It is necessary to determine the preferential pathway to the building as soon as there is an exceedance of the threshold criteria beneath the building.

The situation required to trigger a utility investigation will never arise as long as the SSDS is going, as that is currently causing the sub-slab probes to read 0% CH₄ under Building 15 and because the gas probes in question have never had a reading above 100% LEL (they have come close though).

If it is necessary to have the gas probes surrounding the building be a trigger for a utility corridor investigation, then consider that OAC 3745-27-12 (E)(5)(a) provides threshold criteria for action

regarding explosive gas levels at landfills. 100% LEL requires an action at the property boundary (they are assuming we don't have occupied structures directly on top of the landfill). An exceedance of 100% LEL at the gas probes in question would be near occupied structures on the landfill. It would be more appropriate to use the 10% LEL criteria they are using for the sub-slab reading at the gas probes as the gas probes are next to Building 15.

b. GP-02 – GP-02 is an off-site gas probe that exhibits CH₄ levels above 100% LEL in the summer months. In order for the utilities surrounding GP-02 to be sampled, GP-02 must first exhibit concentrations greater than 100% LEL, then select gas probes surrounding GP-02 will be sampled and if any of the select gas probes exhibits a detection above 100% LEL for 2 consecutive weeks, then the utilities surrounding GP-02 will be sampled.

Why would we wait to sample preferential pathways if we are above 100% LEL at a gas probe that is off-site and also is situated near an occupied structure? The LEL exceedance at GP-02 is an ongoing violation of OAC 3745-27-12 – an investigation for preferential pathways coming from SDD&L is necessary as this probe is exhibiting CH₄ levels above the LEL and is off-site near an occupied structure. Consider a utility corridor investigation as well as permanent punch bars along Dryden Road.

The PRPs cite that the CH₄ present at GP-02 may not be from SDD&L, therefore, they need to determine where the methane is coming from.

3. Sampling of utility corridors

a. The WP states that if a utility corridor investigation is triggered, then the PRPs will sample only inside sewers and manholes, and sample around the bedding of utilities they cannot enter. The utility investigation should seek to investigate the pathway, which includes the higher permeable material the utility sits in as well as the interior of the utility. The guidance cited in the work plan (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources *Guidance for Documenting the Investigation of Utility Corridors*, 2013) recommends sampling both inside (when possible) and outside utility lines (not one or the other, as is indicated in the WP).

Please let me know what you think,

Maddie

Madelyn Smith

Site Coordinator – Ohio EPA, Southwest District Office

Division of Environmental Response and Revitalization

401 E. 5th Street

Dayton, OH 45402

937-285-6456

***Ohio EPA's email addresses are changing. Please update your contact information to the new extension @epa.ohio.gov*